

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY
REPORT ON PATENTABILITY
(SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET)

International application No.

PCT/EP2005/000925

Re point V

1. Relevant documents

D1: US-A-5 605 437; D2: US-A-5 154 578

2. The subject matter of claims 1, 6 (apparatus) is not novel
(PCT Article 33(2)).

Document D1 (fig. 2, 5, 6) discloses a gas turbine (cf. abstract) having a turbine (implicit from column 1) and a compressor 1 comprising a compressor housing 2, the compressor being tapped using at least one tap line 25 to remove compressed air (implicit from column 6, lines 17-22), and the tap line 25 having a valve 24 and a cavity 9, 16, 7a-c for thermally influencing the housing (Fig. 2, 3, column 4, lines 55-64 and column 5, lines 1-5, 23-47) which is located upstream of the valve 24, as seen in the direction of flow of the removed air (demonstrated by the direction of the flow arrows 25->27->26), and the cavity 7a-c, originating from a position of the inlet 14 (Fig. 4, 6) of the tap line 25, 27, 26, extending beyond stationary blades 4b and 4c located in this area.

2. The subject matter of claim 4 (method) is novel and
inventive (PCT Article 33(2)).

The 'closing of the valve' from claims 1, 6 when the gas turbine is being run down, in order to delay the cooling of the compressor housing, is neither known from nor suggested by D1: D1 relates to the 'warm start' of a gas turbine and in this respect addresses a different technical problem. D2, column 4, lines 47-51 moves away from this idea by stating that the ventilation circuit is opened when the gas turbine is being run down.

3. Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8

3.1. The subject matter of claims 2, 3, 7, 8 is not novel (PCT Article 33(2)).

- The additional features of claims 2, 3, 7, 8 are likewise known from D1:

stationary blades 4 and locking element 24.

The subject matter of claim 5 is novel and inventive (since it is dependent on claim 4).

Re point VIII

1. Claims 1, 6 are not clear (PCT Article 6).

Although claims 1, 6 have been formulated as separate, independent claims, in reality they appear to relate to the same subject matter and manifestly differ from one another only by differing definitions of the subject matter for which protection is sought. For this reason, the claims are not '**concisely worded**' and do not meet the requirements of PCT Article 6.